

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

LUIS ALBERTO ROMERO,

Defendant and Appellant.

B250171

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. PA053247)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Dalila C. Lyons, Judge. Affirmed.

Charlotte E. Costan, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Defendant, Luis Alberto Romero, appeals from a June 26, 2013 order denying his motion to modify the restitution sum. We affirm the order.

On February 18, 2009, defendant moved for modification of the restitution fine. The motion was denied on April 22, 2009. On June 25, 2013, defendant again moved for modification of the restitution fine. The trial court denied the second motion on June 26, 2013. The trial court stated: “This is an unjustified successive motion. On April 22, 2009, the court (Judge Burt Pines) denied the same motion. As Judge Burt Pines explained, the court imposed a restitution fine of \$200.00, not \$7,491.00 as claimed by defendant. The required \$7,491.00 payment constitutes restitution to the victim’s family and the State Victim’s Compensation Board pursuant to Penal Code section 1202.4 (F). Furthermore, the court of appeal affirmed the trial court’s imposition of this restitution.”

Defendant filed his notice of appeal on July 18, 2013. We appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. After examination of the record, appointed appellate counsel filed an “Opening Brief” in which no issues were raised. Instead, appointed appellate counsel requested this court to independently review the entire record on appeal pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441. (See (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 277-284.) On October 2, 2013, we advised defendant that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or arguments he wishes us to consider. On October 24, 2013, defendant requested removal of his present counsel and appointment of another appellate counsel. We denied defendant’s requests on October 24, 2013.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied appointed appellate counsel has fully complied with her responsibilities. No argument exists favorable to defendant on appeal. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 112-113; *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 441.) In our prior opinion, we affirmed the imposition of restitution but modified the abstract of judgment to reflect the trial court’s oral order of joint and several liability. (*People v. Romero* (Dec. 19, 2008, B203217) [nonpub. opn.].) Defendant’s challenge of the restitution sum is barred by the doctrine of the law of the case. (*People v. Turner* (2004) 34 Cal.4th 406, 417; *People v. Stanley* (1995) 10 Cal.4th 764, 786.)

The June 26, 2013 order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

TURNER, P. J.

We concur:

MOSK, J.

KRIEGLER, J.